

Page Denied

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

~~SECRET~~

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
Committee on Imagery Requirements and Exploitation
Washington, DC 20505

8 August 1988

25X1 MEMORANDUM FOR:

SAS/CPG

SUBJECT: COMIREX Comments on RMS DCR Number 2

25X1 1. The following are a consolidation of comments received from the COMIREX attendees at the May 1988 Design Concept Review. The comments primarily focus on five major areas: hardware architecture, performance analysis, workstations, conditional tasking and the system operations concept (SOC). Additional comments address areas related to S/W architecture and cost trades.

25X1 2. COMIREX has the overall concern that the contractors still have underestimated the RMS processing load. As stated in a previous related AIM memorandum, dated 20 April 1988 addressed to Bill Domphy and Gayden Morrill, we believe that the number of MIPS required to support RMS requirements should be greater than what the contractors are presenting in their three architectural proposals, i.e. 24 MIPS for TANDEM, 40 MIPS for DEC and 47 MIPS for IBM. Additionally, COMIREX has serious reservations that TANDEM will not be able to support other RMS requirements. Some of these reservations are categorized as follows: a) TANDEM's major applications have been related to a single process and is not known to support general and multiple purpose processing very well; b) TANDEM software is not IBM compatible; and c) the fact that TANDEM is perceived to have a poor customer support and maintenance reputation. Other COMIREX concerns regarding TANDEM include the potential hidden costs associated with training and O&M for COMIREX/DIA personnel, as well as architectural considerations of how TANDEM processing configuration will support distribution of RMS code.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

25X1 3. With regard to performance, COMIREX has two major areas of concern; the first, is our concern that the throughput timeline requirements will not be supported by the proposed S/W and H/W architectures, and secondly, we have several questions related to the methodology used for the performance analysis models. A list of COMIREX's questions and concerns have been provided to you in a memorandum, dated 9 June 1988. We will formally express our concerns on the performance analysis after the next performance analysis TEM.

25X1 4. The contractors presented a good overview of the workstation subsystem identification and description, however, we have concern with their proposed workstation functional matrix and site allocation. We understand that this was the contractors first in-depth proposal regarding workstations and that they had little or no detail from DRD-2 to work from. COMIREX has just completed its draft on workstation functionality and plans to initiate a draft on user allocation. Recommend that all interested parties work closely in the next few months on this requirement.

25X1 5. The conditional tasking presentation was well received by COMIREX, and we believe that the contractors displayed a very good understanding of the requirement. Specifically, the contractor presented an implementation concept approach that was thorough and well-thought out. Although, time did not permit it, the contractors also had prepared a detailed conditional tasking scenario. Based on COMIREX's subsequent review of the scenario, we believe that the contractor used very good examples that illustrated their implementation concept. However, COMIREX does have two concerns with their concept. Based on what the contractors presented, user specified instructions would be broken down by RMS via a translation process into simple rules and then stored in RMS. Will this translation process be more costly to implement in RMS and will the quantities of conditional tasking rules (currently at 5,000 in DRD-3) need to be increased?

25X1 6. COMIREX believes the purpose and utility of the SOC are still not clearly stated. Although good points were made and there seems to be legitimate reasons for pursuing some activities, other areas are clearly not necessary because they have either been done, or, in our opinion, incorrectly developed by the contractors. For example, how are the contractors validating their data and assumptions? Counting related DCID 1/2 (currently referred to

SECRET

SECRET

25X1 7. In reference to S/W architecture, the contractors briefed that the RMS software is designed to provide an Executive Support Service as a layer in front of the operating system. COMIREX has a concern that the Executive Support Service will not be able to support large scale systems, such as RMS. We recommend that more investigation and efficiency testing of this layer be done by the contractors to ensure adherence to the timelines. [redacted]

25X1 8. The presentation on cost trades and the perceived lack of importance that the RMS study Contractors have put on the user aids and user interface requirements is of major concern to COMIREX. As you know, much of COMIREX's effort in RMS has been focused on improving the user interface. Almost all of the major user tools were recommended for deletion or descoping. Although the presentation was intended to be informative, it appeared to be negative in nature. [redacted]

25X1 9. If you have any questions on the above, please call. [redacted]

25X1 [redacted]
Chief, RDB/DEEG/COMIREX

25X1 [redacted]
SECRET

SECRET

SUBJECT: COMIREX Comments on RMS DCR Number 2

DISTRIBUTION:

25X1 Copy 1 - [REDACTED], SAS/CPG, [REDACTED]
25X1 2 - [REDACTED] C/RDB/DEEG/CMX, [REDACTED]
25X1 3 - DEEG Chrono
25X1 4 - ICS Registry, [REDACTED]
25X1 DCI/ICS/CMX/DEEG/RDB/[REDACTED] (8 AUG 88)

25X1

SECRET